

**Lake Whatcom DNR Landscape Plan  
10-10-02 PDEIS Workshop  
Flipchart Notes of Public Comments**

**PDEIS Process and Document Comments & Questions**

What precipitated the plan development?

Who is the decision maker, the Board of Natural Resources?

Are CDs of the PDEIS available?

Will the questions raised during the PDEIS process be posted on the website along with the DNR responses?

Is it possible that none of the alternatives identified in the PDEIS would be selected?

Why are we taking the time to consider the 'no action' alternative? It's illegal.

What is the motivation for this process to begin? What is the timeline once a decision is made? How long is the process for implementation?

Did all of the alternatives come from DNR?

Definition of 'riparian' requested.

Definition of 'Type 5' streams requested.

Are there tribal cultural areas in the plan area?

How did studies compare between in-house DNR studies and the UW studies?

Is DNR exempt for buffers on Type 5 streams? The speaker has had to implement buffers on Type 5 streams.

With any of the alternatives would it be possible for DNR to trade the land parcels to private owners and could the land be clear cut at that time?

Is anything being harvested currently within these areas on the map?

Who really owns the land? Is the cost of managing the land the motivation for this plan?

## Analysis of Alternatives Questions and Comments, and General Comments

If we decided to select Alternative 1, could the land in the planning area be traded to private ownership?

Has a figure on lost cultural resources been identified in Alternative 1? DNR rules, state WACs, and tribal policies hold that no cultural resources should be harmed.

Is Alternative 1 a comparison alternative? It is not really an alternative option within this area.

Alternative 1 shows 50 percent of income going to social and ecological benefits. What are they?

The cut in production due to constraints added progressively by each alternative presented in the PDEIS is a concern. Do alternatives include the HCP and fish rules? What about Alternative 1, which does not meet legislation?

Are the prescriptions in Alternative 1 used by all private and state lands in the watershed? How much difference is there on management of lands just outside of the DNR landscape plan area?

How much money can DNR forests around Lake Whatcom generate? What will be done with funds generated? What percent goes toward schools? Fiduciary duties are established for DNR. How are they established and can they be changed?

Have SEPA issues regarding legislative action been addressed in Alternative 2?

How is a buffer measured, by slope or a flat line?

Do you do helicopter harvesting?

Alternative 3 includes recognition of insect and disease increase potential. Has wildfire risk potential been assessed?

Since Alternative 3 does not use chemicals, what is used?

How could it be concluded in Alternative 3 that a wider stream buffer would have no impact on water quality? What parameters are being looked at?

Water quality seems very good now. What is the time span for the improvements that are outlined in the assessment?

What percentage of DNR lands in watershed reservoirs for cities over 50,000 are managed and logged?

In Alternative 4 an increase of insect / disease is noted. How is that addressed in Alternatives 1 through 3? Disease, fires, insects are natural and needed for forests.

Are all the trusts represented at the table when the alternatives are being developed?

Has DNR factored in the value of larger trees in the area due to longer rotation periods?

It is okay to cut trees for kids.

If people are concerned about fires, then they should be concerned about logging and harvesting; that is the greatest cause.

Financial information presentations at this meeting were confusing. It would be helpful to show figures comparatively between the alternatives – i.e., 'x' is being reduced from 'y.'

The speaker moved here for the air quality. What is the impact on the air quality with the harvest scenarios? What do the kids do for air?

What is it about Alternative 5 that does not meet the committee's objectives?

Alternative 5 shows no revenues from harvests. Are the recreational or cultural efforts of restoration savings from not having clear cuts taken into consideration in the valuation? Can DNR include such numbers or is that a state issue?

The speaker would like to know how comments submitted on the website will be considered.

The library is not an appropriate place for document review. The document needs to be available on CD or in some other way for reviewing and marking up the copy.

What can be done to protect this planning area in perpetuity? Regarding the Lake Samish area above Reed Lake, the community was assured the land would not to be logged due to slope stability issues. Some authority allowed the DNR to permit someone else to log and clear cut.

There is a lack of information in these alternatives in terms of addressing the land practices that would apply to traded lands. An assurance needs to be added to the alternatives for addressing the protection of land from being traded or sold.

DNR has repositioned parcels for more effective management of land, resources, guided by the legislative directive. Land exchange hearings are held in areas of significant holdings and there is a commitment to openness so people have involvement in the process of exchanges.

In Whatcom County in the process with Trillium lands there was open, public process. The land above the Glenhaven area was not in DNR holding.

DNR has allowed for road building through DNR lands in the Lake Whatcom Landscape planning area.

The speaker is tired of clear cutting and what it does to overall environment. Yet, from timber perspective, it may not be worth the time or value to thin.

The speaker requests a hard copy of the DEIS document when it comes out (postal address on audio tape).

Bird mortality and impacts from towers in the area should be reviewed as part of this plan.

There is concern that the DNR plan to present to the BNR does not show monetary value commensurate with the impacts to water quality.

Who sits on the Board of Natural Resources?

In the end will there be a blend of the alternatives?

Reduction in access to the forest is listed in the alternatives. How could that be when the roads are still there?

Are you under obligation to manage the roads in the area?